

1 **SARS-CoV-2 antibody immunoassays in serial**
2 **samples reveal earlier seroconversion in acutely ill**
3 **COVID-19 patients developing ARDS**

4 Short title: Early SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion reveals ARDS

5
6 Marie-Luise Buchholtz^{1¶}, Florian M. Arend^{1¶}, Peter Eichhorn¹, Michael Weigand¹, Alisa
7 Kleinhempel¹, Kurt Häusler¹, Mathias Bruegel¹, Lesca M. Holdt¹, Daniel Teupser^{1*}

8
9 ¹Institute of Laboratory Medicine, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

10
11 *Corresponding author

12 Email: daniel.teupser@med.uni-muenchen.de (DT)

13
14 [¶] These authors contributed equally to this work.

15
16
17
18 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, immunoassay, antibody, ARDS

19 **Abstract**

20 **Objectives:** During the COVID-19 pandemic, SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing has been
21 suggested for (1) screening populations for disease prevalence, (2) diagnostics, and
22 (3) guiding therapeutic applications. Here, we conducted a detailed clinical evaluation
23 of four Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays in samples from acutely ill COVID-19 patients
24 and in two negative cohorts.

25 **Methods:** 443 serum specimens from serial sampling of 29 COVID-19 patients were
26 used to determine clinical sensitivities. Patients were stratified for the presence of
27 acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Individual serum specimens from a pre-
28 COVID-19 cohort of 238 healthy subjects and from a PCR-negative clinical cohort of
29 257 patients were used to determine clinical specificities. All samples were measured
30 side-by-side with the Anti-SARS-CoV-2-ELISA (IgG), Anti-SARS-CoV-2-ELISA (IgA)
31 and Anti-SARS-CoV-2-NCP-ELISA (IgG) (Euroimmun AG, Lübeck, Germany) and the
32 Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ECLIA (Roche Diagnostics International, Rotkreuz,
33 Switzerland).

34 **Results:** Median seroconversion occurred earlier in ARDS patients (8-9 days) than in
35 non-ARDS patients (11-17 days), except for EUR N-IgG. Rates of positivity and mean
36 signal ratios in the ARDS group were significantly higher than in the non-ARDS group.
37 Sensitivities between the four tested immunoassays were equivalent. In the set of
38 negative samples, the specificity of the Anti-SARS-CoV-2-ELISA (IgA) was lower
39 (93.9 %) compared to all other assays (≥ 98.8 %) and the specificity of Anti-SARS-CoV-
40 2-NCP-ELISA (IgG) was lower (98.8 %) than that of Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2
41 (100 %).

42 **Conclusions:** Serial sampling in COVID-19 patients revealed earlier seroconversion
43 and higher signal ratios of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies as a potential risk marker for the

44 development of ARDS, suggesting a utility for antibody testing in acutely diseased
45 patients.

46 Introduction

47 Since the beginning of 2020, a large number of serological tests for antibodies against
48 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the causative agent
49 of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), has flooded the market to complement direct
50 virus detection by PCR. As recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and
51 Prevention, direct virus detection by PCR is essential and indispensable in acute
52 diagnostics [1]. In contrast, the role of serological testing for antibodies against SARS-
53 CoV-2 is less clear. It has been reported that median seroconversion occurs at 7-14
54 days [2-6], and later than PCR-positivity. In addition, it has been noted that individuals
55 with mild or asymptomatic disease may only present delayed and transient serum titers
56 of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies [7, 8]. This makes serological testing unsuitable for
57 diagnostics in the early phase of disease. Nevertheless, SARS-CoV-2 serology may
58 still play a role in diagnostics of patients suspected for a previous contact with SARS-
59 CoV-2 and (false) negative PCR [6, 9, 10].

60 In contrast to diagnostics, it is without question that SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing has
61 an important part in epidemiological studies. In these scenarios, the highest possible
62 specificity of tests is of utmost importance, since the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 is
63 currently low in most populations, and therefore, only highly specific tests lead to
64 acceptable false positive rates [11-14]. SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing may also be
65 suitable to identify convalescent individuals for plasma donation and to identify
66 potential vaccination responses, even though little is currently known about the
67 protective effects of different types of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies [9, 15].

68 Main antigens to induce an immune response in the host with subsequent antibody
69 production are the nucleocapsid (N) protein and the spike (S) protein with its receptor

70 binding domain (RBD) [16]. Several Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays detect the N-
71 protein, others the entire spike protein, its S1 subunit or the RBD, which is responsible
72 for the entry of SARS-CoV-2 into the host cells via the ACE-receptor [17, 18].
73 Designing immunoassays with high specificities is challenging, given the homology of
74 SARS-CoV-2 to other coronaviruses [2, 16, 18, 19]. Cross-reactivity may be observed
75 with SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV, due to partial conservation of subunits of the S- and
76 N-proteins [2, 19].

77 In the present study, we examined the performance of four CE-certified immunoassays
78 detecting antibodies against the N- and the S1-proteins, two of which have received
79 emergency use authorization by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). These
80 immunoassays can be automated and are suitable for rapid diagnostics in clinical
81 routine. The two FDA approved tests were the Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2-ELISA
82 (IgG) (EUR S-IgG) (catalog number: EI 2606-9601 G) and the Elecsys Anti-SARS-
83 CoV-2 electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (Roche-Ab) by Roche (catalog
84 number: REF 09203079190). These tests were complemented by the Euroimmun Anti-
85 SARS-CoV-2-ELISA (IgA) (EUR S-IgA) (catalog number: EI 2606-9601 A) and the
86 Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2-NCP-ELISA (IgG) (EUR N-IgG) (catalog number: EI
87 2606-9601-2 G) immunoassays. The EUR S-IgG and EUR S-IgA immunoassays
88 detect IgG and IgA antibodies against the recombinant S1 domain of the SARS-CoV-
89 2 spike protein, respectively. EUR N-IgG detects IgG-antibodies against a modified
90 nucleocapsid protein and Roche-Ab detects antibodies (including IgG) against a
91 renatured chaperone nucleocapsid fusion protein.

92 An important current clinical question in the COVID-19 pandemic is the early
93 identification of patients with a high risk for severe clinical symptoms. Acute respiratory
94 distress syndrome (ARDS) is a typical complication of COVID-19, frequently requiring

95 therapy with ventilators [20]. Previous studies explored the question whether there is
96 a correlation with the dynamics and level of SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers and the
97 severity of COVID-19. Some studies reported an association of antibody titers with
98 disease severity [3, 4, 21-23]. Previous studies were mainly based on cumulative
99 samples of different individuals at different times over the course of disease. It has
100 been proposed that sensitivity would be ideally determined at various days
101 postsymptom onset [12]. In our study, we therefore used serial samples in hospitalized
102 patients to assess immunoassay sensitivities after the onset of symptoms, where
103 samples for a follow-up of at least 15 days were available.

104 Our study had two main objectives: (1) To evaluate antibody dynamics and sensitivities
105 in serial samples from acutely ill COVID-19 patients with the stratification of the cohort
106 in non-ARDS and ARDS patients, and (2) to assess the specificity of the four tests,
107 side by side in a pre-COVID-19 cohort and a PCR-negative clinical cohort of patients
108 presenting with COVID-19-like symptoms.

109 **Materials and methods**

110

111 **Samples and cohorts**

112 Serum samples from three different cohorts were used:

113 (1) PCR-positive clinical cohort: Samples from 29 patients, admitted to the hospital of
114 LMU Munich with acute COVID-19 confirmed by positive PCR were collected over time
115 from leftover material of samples submitted to our Institute for routine laboratory
116 diagnostics. We collected serial samples from each patient (between 7 and 30 time
117 points) covering a period of up to 64 days from the start of symptoms, adding up to a
118 total of 443 samples (Fig 1). Samples were stored at -80°C as 250 µl aliquots in 2D
119 barcoded biobanking vials (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, Massachusetts, USA) in the
120 LMU LabMed Biobank. Clinical data of the PCR-positive clinical cohort (sex, age, date
121 of symptom onset, date of first positive PCR, sepsis, immunosuppression, ARDS,
122 death) were retrieved from electronic patient records. The patients were sampled at
123 both regular wards and intensive care units. Anonymized analysis has been approved
124 by the Ethics Committee of LMU Munich (reference number 20-552).

125 (2) Pre-COVID-19 cohort: Samples from 238 healthy pre-COVID-19 subjects were
126 collected from 04/2016 until 10/2019 as part of the Munich Study on Biomarker
127 Reference Values (MyRef) for establishing age dependent reference values for
128 laboratory tests. All samples originated from healthy individuals between 18 and 80
129 years without pre-existing conditions, pregnancy, lactation, smoking, excessive alcohol
130 use or long-term medication (except oral contraceptives). The study has been

131 approved by the Ethics Committee of LMU Munich (reference number 11/16), and
132 written informed consent has been obtained from all participants.

133 (3) PCR-negative clinical cohort: Samples from 257 patients, admitted to the hospital
134 of LMU Munich with possible symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 but with a negative PCR result
135 were collected from leftover material of samples submitted to our Institute for routine
136 laboratory diagnostics. Samples were stored at -80°C as 250 µl aliquots in 2D
137 barcoded biobanking vials (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, Massachusetts, USA) in the
138 LMU LabMed Biobank. Demographic data were obtained from the electronic patient
139 records. Anonymized analysis has been approved by the Ethics Committee of LMU
140 Munich (reference number 20-552).

141

142 **Serological assays**

143 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were analyzed using four commercially available
144 immunoassays on analytical platforms, which are part of the operations for routine
145 laboratory services provided by our Institute.

146 EUR S-IgA, EUR S-IgG and EUR N-IgG assays were semiquantitative enzyme-linked
147 immunosorbent assays (ELISA) from Euroimmun (Euroimmun AG, Lübeck, Germany).

148 EUR S-IgA and EUR S-IgG detect IgA and IgG against a recombinant S1 domain of
149 the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein. EUR N-IgG detects IgG against a modified
150 nucleocapsid protein. Assays were run on the fully automated ELISA processing
151 platform Analyzer I (Euroimmun AG, Lübeck, Germany) according to the
152 manufacturer's instructions. Optical extinctions were normalized to an internal assay
153 calibrator and reported as signal ratios between samples and calibrators. Signal ratios
154 ≥ 1.1 were designated positive as suggested by the manufacturer. Values of the EUR

155 S-IgA exceeding the upper limit were calculated as upper limit plus one. The Roche-
156 Ab assay was a semiquantitative electrochemiluminescence immunoassay from Roche
157 Diagnostics (Roche Diagnostics International AG, Rotkreuz, Switzerland). It detected
158 antibodies (including IgG) against a renatured chaperone nucleocapsid fusion protein.
159 The assay was run on a cobas 8000 e 801 automated analyzer according to the
160 manufacturer's instructions. Results were reported as signal ratio between samples
161 and cutoff calibrator. Signal ratios ≥ 1.0 were designated positive as suggested by the
162 manufacturer. All samples were measured using all four immunoassays and expressed
163 as qualitative result and as semiquantitative signal ratio. Individual values were
164 considered to remain constant until the next measurement in the same individual.

165

166 **Statistics**

167 Statistical analysis was performed with RStudio (R version 3.6.1) using the package
168 'stats'. Patient subgroups in the PCR-positive clinical cohort were evaluated by their
169 characteristics using the Fisher's exact test or the Mann-Whitney-U test. Sensitivities
170 were compared by points in time using the McNemar test for paired data. Sensitivities
171 between different patient subgroups were determined using the Fishers exact test.
172 Confidence intervals were calculated using an exact binomial test. Mean signal ratios
173 between patient subgroups were compared by points in time using Welch's t-test.
174 Seroconversion times between patient subgroups were analyzed using the Mann-
175 Whitney-U test. Specificities between different assays were compared using the
176 McNemar test for paired data. Signal ratios were correlated using Spearman's
177 correlation coefficient. Age differences between SARS-CoV-2 antibody positive and
178 negative patients in the negative cohort were analyzed using the Mann-Whitney-U test.

179 Results

180 Patients' characteristics are shown in Table 1. Patients were stratified according to
181 diagnosis into groups without and with ARDS. The patients' characteristics did not
182 differ significantly between the two groups (Table 1).

183 We first determined sensitivities of the four immunoassays categorized into positive
184 and negative test results over time. Median seroconversion times for EUR S-IgA, EUR
185 S-IgG, EUR N-IgG and Roche-Ab were comparable and are represented in Table 1.
186 The dynamics of test sensitivities for all patients from day 5 to day 40 after symptom
187 onset is shown in Fig 2A. Sensitivities for the different assays increased from between
188 0% and 25% at day 5 to between 90% and 97% at day 40 after symptom onset (Fig
189 2A). No significant difference between sensitivities of the four immunoassays was
190 found, except for day 16 where EUR N-IgG was more sensitive than EUR S-IgG
191 ($p=0.041$) (S1 Fig). Likewise, no significant differences between sensitivities of the four
192 immunoassays were found when grouping time points into bins (S1 Table).

193 We next examined the results of the four immunoassays in subgroups of non-ARDS
194 and ARDS patients. Importantly, median seroconversion times were only 8-9 days in
195 ARDS patients and 11-17 days in non-ARDS patients. The difference in
196 seroconversion time was statistically significant between ARDS patients and non-
197 ARDS patients for all immunoassays except EUR N-IgG ($p=0.002$ for EUR S-IgA,
198 $p=0.013$ for EUR S-IgG, $p=0.337$ for EUR N-IgG, $p=0.024$ for Roche-Ab) (Table 1).

199 In addition, ARDS patients reached positivity at an earlier point in time than non-ARDS
200 patients, as shown by significantly higher rates of positivity of the different tests
201 between days 8 and 16 after symptom onset in the ARDS group (Figs 2B, 2C and 3).
202 EUR S-IgG and EUR S-IgA discriminated between the two subgroups as early as day

203 8, whereas EUR N-IgG and Roche-Ab discriminated between the two subgroups
204 starting on day 10 (Fig 3A). Mean signal ratios were significantly higher between days
205 7 to 19 for ARDS patients (Fig 3B).

206 To further investigate this finding, we compared the mean signal ratios between the
207 two subgroups over the course of time (Fig 2D). Significant differences in mean signal
208 ratio were found as early as day 7 after symptom onset for EUR S-IgA and EUR S-IgG
209 ($p= 0.004$, $p=0.019$) and day 8 for EUR N-IgG and Roche-Ab ($p=0.008$, $p=0.037$)
210 (Fig 3B), corroborating our prior observations for the qualitative results. Additionally,
211 we found significant differences of signal ratios between deceased and surviving
212 patients for EUR S-IgG, EUR S-IgA and EUR N-IgG (days 12-35), and between septic
213 and non-septic patients for Roche-Ab on day 28 (S2 Fig.). No differences were found
214 between these groups for qualitative results. Pairwise comparison of signal ratios
215 between the different immunoassays was performed and correlations are shown in
216 S3 Fig. Distributions of signal ratios are shown in S4 Fig. The individual dynamics of
217 signal ratios and clinical characterization for each patient are visualized in S5-S7 Figs.
218 Individual dynamics of qualitative results and clinical characterization for each patient
219 are visualized in S8-S10 Figs. One patient showed no antibody response at all. Another
220 patient showed an antibody response only with the S-protein based immunoassays,
221 whereas the Roche-Ab and EUR N-IgG immunoassays remained negative over the
222 course of 64 days since onset of symptoms. One patient converted from positive to
223 negative results only in the Roche-Ab immunoassay at day 39. Another
224 immunosuppressed patient showed negative results only in the EUR S-IgG
225 immunoassay over the period of 28 days since symptom onset.

226 We also determined the specificities of the four immunoassays (EUR S-IgA, EUR S-
227 IgG, EUR N-IgG, Roche-Ab) using a pre-COVID-19 cohort of healthy individuals and

228 in a PCR-negative clinical cohort of patients presenting with COVID-19-like symptoms
229 (Table 2). Three subjects in the PCR-negative clinical cohort showed a positive result
230 in all four immunoassays, suggesting that they had been previously exposed to SARS-
231 CoV-2, and were therefore excluded from the following analysis. In the pre-COVID-19
232 cohort, EUR S-IgA consistently showed lower specificities than all other tests
233 ($p=0.00014$, $p=0.00014$, $p=0.00002$). In the PCR-negative clinical cohort, EUR S-IgA
234 showed lower specificities when compared to EUR S-IgG and Roche-Ab, but not when
235 compared to EUR N-IgG ($p=0.016$, $p=0.004$, $p=0.181$) (Table 3). False positive results
236 did not overlap between immunoassays except for one sample in the pre-COVID-19
237 cohort that showed a positive result in all three Euroimmun immunoassays, but not in
238 the Roche immunoassay (S11 Fig).

239 When performing pairwise comparisons between tests in the complete set of 495
240 negative samples, we found that EUR S-IgA consistently showed significantly lower
241 specificities compared to the three other immunoassays ($p \leq 0.00008$) (Table 3). In
242 addition, EUR N-IgG also showed a significantly lower specificity than Roche-Ab
243 ($p=0.041$). Furthermore, we found a significant age difference between false positive
244 subjects and negative subjects in the EUR S-IgA and the EUR N-IgG immunoassay
245 ($p=0.029$ and $p=0.025$, respectively) (S2 Table). Distributions of signal ratios are
246 shown in S12 and S13 Figs.

247 **Discussion**

248 Using serial serum sampling in patients hospitalized for COVID-19, we found that
249 patients who developed ARDS in the course of disease had a substantially shorter
250 seroconversion time (8–9 days) compared to patients who did not develop ARDS (11-
251 17 days) (Table 1). This finding was consistent for IgA, IgG and total antibody
252 responses. Earlier seropositivity in ARDS patients was confirmed by significantly
253 higher rates of positivity of the different tests between days 8-16 after symptom onset
254 (Figs 2B, 2C and 3). These findings were consistent for qualitative and semiquantitative
255 analysis. Evidence for an earlier seroconversion in severe compared to mild cases has
256 previously been reported by Yongchen et al. [24]. Similar to ours, this study used a
257 serial sampling strategy, but included only a very limited number of samples and cases,
258 providing no evidence for statistical significance of the findings. Another study
259 analyzed IgM and total antibodies in single or serial samples from hospitalized patients
260 and found that severe cases had significantly higher SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S1 antibody
261 levels after day 6 from symptom onset [21]. While only few studies suggest earlier
262 seroconversion in severe cases, a larger number reported an association of increased
263 antibody levels with disease severity, intensive care unit status, and hospitalization [3,
264 4, 25] corroborating our findings for ARDS. In contrast, one study also reported a lack
265 of association between antibody levels and disease severity [26], however, this study
266 was only based on 15 PCR-positive cases with 2 to 6 serial measurements and might
267 have been underpowered [26]. The National SARS-CoV-2 Serology Assay Evaluation
268 Group could not find any evidence of a difference in sensitivity between immunoassays
269 with regard to disease severity. However, the immunoassays investigated were
270 different from our study, with the exception of the Roche-Ab immunoassay [27]. Median
271 seroconversion times in our complete cohort of COVID-19 patients were 9-10 days

272 since symptom onset for IgA, IgG and total antibodies, which is in line with other
273 studies, reporting a seroconversion time of 7-14 days for IgM and IgG since symptom
274 onset [3, 4, 6]. We found no differences of sensitivity in the early phase of infection
275 suggesting that the detected antibody subtypes (IgA, IgG or total antibodies)
276 seroconvert simultaneously. A simultaneous rise of all antibody subtypes [6] or an
277 earlier rise of IgG in COVID-19 patients [5] has also been observed by others, and
278 differs from infections with other agents, where IgM and IgA rise first and are markers
279 of acute disease.

280 Furthermore, we found no significant differences in the sensitivity between the four
281 immunoassays over the course of time (except for day 16). However, this question is
282 an issue of current debate. Whereas Van Elslande et al. [28] report a faster
283 seroconversion for N-protein based than for S-protein based SARS-CoV-2-antibody
284 detection, a lack of a significant difference between S-based and N-based
285 immunoassays regarding IgG and total antibodies was also found by others [29, 30].

286 When grouping the time points into bins, the EUR S-IgA, EUR N-IgG and Roche-Ab
287 reached highest rates of sensitivity (92.9% – 96.4%) on days 20-29, the EUR S-IgG
288 on days 30-39 (92.3%). EUR S-IgA sensitivities ranged from 88.0 % to 100.0% in other
289 studies [13, 31-33], while EUR S-IgG ranged from 85.4% to 100% [32, 34]. Herroelen
290 et al. [31] and Weidner et al. [35] found a sensitivity for EUR N-IgG of 90.5% and 88.9%
291 respectively. Sensitivity for Roche-Ab ranged from 89.2% to 100% [36-38]. Therefore,
292 peak levels of sensitivities found in our study were well within the range of others
293 studies, except for EUR N-IgG, where we found a higher sensitivity. However, data on
294 sensitivity of EUR N-IgG are still scarce. While we did not find any differences in the
295 time binned sensitivities between the investigated immunoassays in our study, Meyer

296 et al. found a significantly higher seropositivity for IgA (91.1%) than IgG (84.8%) 11-20
297 days after symptom onset with the EUR S-protein based ELISAs [13].

298 The analysis of individual dynamics of signal ratios and sensitivities showed one
299 patient who developed no antibody response at all with all four tested immunoassays.
300 This may be explained by immunosuppressive treatment of that patient. However, our
301 study also included other patients with immunosuppressive therapy who clearly
302 showed an antibody response. Therefore, the type of immunosuppressive therapy may
303 be worth considering in further studies. Another patient showed an antibody response
304 only with the S-protein based immunoassays, but not with the N-protein based EUR
305 N-IgG and Roche-Ab (S8-S10 Figs). This finding is related to the controversial topic,
306 whether antibodies against the N- or S-protein have higher sensitivity and rise earlier
307 in the course of disease. From the analysis of individual antibody dynamics however,
308 we cannot derive an answer to that question. It may be noted that some studies use
309 the start of symptoms while others use positive PCR testing dates to monitor the
310 occurrence of antibodies. We deemed the date of the first positive PCR as less reliable
311 than the start of symptoms, because it is more dependent on external factors and
312 therefore rather focused on the start of symptoms.

313 When analyzing the specificities in two COVID-19 negative cohorts, we found that the
314 EUR S-IgA immunoassay consistently showed a lower specificity compared to the
315 three other immunoassays. This finding is in line with other studies reporting a lower
316 specificity of EUR S-IgA as well [2, 32, 33, 39-41]. Importantly, we found a significant
317 difference in age distribution between the group of false positive subjects and true
318 negative subjects for EUR S-IgA and EUR N-IgG results. The mean age of false
319 positives was higher than the mean age of true negatives for EUR N-IgG, and the other
320 way around for EUR S-IgA (S2 Table). It has been speculated that older populations

321 might have higher cross-reactivities due to a longer history of interaction with other
322 types of coronaviruses [12]. Accordingly, Gorse et al. reported that over 90% of adults
323 over age 50 present antibodies to four common circulating coronaviruses [42]. This
324 might explain our result regarding age differences of false positives for EUR N-IgG, but
325 not for EUR S-IgA.

326 With regard to specificity, the EUR S-IgG and EUR N-IgG showed similar results in our
327 study. Specificities for the EUR S-IgG and EUR N-IgG immunoassays (99.4% and
328 98.8%, respectively) were in line with a number of studies [13, 31, 43, 44], while others
329 also reported lower specificities for EUR S-IgG (91.9% - 96.2%) [39, 45, 46]. In our
330 study, the Roche-Ab immunoassay, which demonstrated 100% specificity, had a
331 significantly higher specificity than EUR S-IgA and EUR N-IgG in the total negative
332 cohort. Similarly, others reported 100 % specificity of the Roche-Ab immunoassay as
333 well [38, 47, 48], whereas Ekelund et al. found a specificity of 98 % [37]. Despite our
334 relatively high number of samples in the PCR positive cohort, the absolute number of
335 individual subjects is limited. Therefore, it will be interesting to see whether these
336 results can be replicated in independent, prospective cohorts.

337 In conclusion, the specificities of the four SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays investigated in
338 our study were higher for Roche-Ab and EUR S-IgG compared to EUR S-IgA and EUR
339 N-IgG. In contrast, the sensitivities were comparable. Serial sampling revealed an early
340 rise in SARS-CoV-2 IgA, IgG and total antibodies as a potential indicator of ARDS in
341 COVID-19 patients. This finding suggests that SARS-CoV-2 antibodies may serve as
342 biomarkers for early detection of ARDS, as a complication of COVID-19, and warrants
343 replication in future studies.

344 **Acknowledgments**

345 We thank Britta Pauli and Babett Rannefeld for their expert technical assistance.

346 **References**

- 347 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coronavirus Disease 2019
348 (COVID-19), Overview of Testing for SARS-CoV-2 [accessed on 2020 Oct 15].
349 Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/testing-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/testing-overview.html)
350 [overview.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/testing-overview.html).
- 351 2. Okba NM, Muller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, et al.
352 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2-specific antibody responses in
353 coronavirus disease patients. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020;26:1478-88.
- 354 3. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to
355 SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020 Mar
356 28. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa344.
- 357 4. Tan W, Lu Y, Zhang J, Wang J, Dan Y, Tan Z, et al. Viral kinetics and antibody
358 responses in patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv [Preprint]*. 2020 [posted 2020 Mar 26].
359 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.24.20042382>.
- 360 5. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, et al. Temporal
361 profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody
362 responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet*
363 *Infect Dis* 2020;20:565-74.
- 364 6. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody
365 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020;26:845-848.
- 366 7. Cervia C, Nilsson J, Zurbuchen Y, Valaperti A, Schreiner J, Wolfensberger A, et
367 al. Systemic and mucosal antibody responses specific to SARS-CoV-2 during mild
368 versus severe COVID-19. *Allergy Clin Immunol* 2020;20:S0091-6749(20)31623-7.

- 369 8. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, Li Q, Deng HJ, Yuan J, et al. Clinical and
370 immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med*
371 2020;26:1200-4.
- 372 9. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting diagnostic tests for SARS-
373 CoV-2. *JAMA* 2020;323(22):2249-2251.
- 374 10. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, Spijker R, Taylor-Phillips S, et
375 al. Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with SARS-CoV-2.
376 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;6:CD013652.
- 377 11. Theel ES, Slev P, Wheeler S, Couturier MR, Wong SJ, Kadkhoda K. The role of
378 antibody testing for SARS-CoV-2: is there one? *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58:e00797-20.
- 379 12. Farnsworth CW, Anderson NW. SARS-CoV-2 Serology: Much Hype, Little Data.
380 *Clin Chem* 2020;66:875-7.
- 381 13. Meyer B, Torriani G, Yerly S, Mazza L, Calame A, Arm-Vernez I, et al. Validation
382 of a commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological immunoassay. *Clin Microbiol*
383 *Infect* 2020;26:1386-1394.
- 384 14. Diamandis P, Prassas I, Diamandis EP. Antibody tests for COVID-19: drawing
385 attention to the importance of analytical specificity. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2020;58:1144-
386 45.
- 387 15. Bohn MK, Lippi G, Horvath A, Sethi S, Koch D, Ferrari M, et al. Molecular,
388 serological, and biochemical diagnosis and monitoring of COVID-19: IFCC taskforce
389 evaluation of the latest evidence. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2020;58:1037-52.

- 390 16. Shi J, Han D, Zhang R, Li J, Zhang R. Molecular and serological assays for
391 SARS-CoV-2: insights from genome and clinical characteristics. *Clin Chem*
392 2020;66:1030-1046.
- 393 17. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia
394 outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*
395 2020;579:270-73.
- 396 18. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, Niu P, Yang B, Wu H, et al. Genomic characterisation and
397 epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor
398 binding. *Lancet* 2020;395(10224):565-74.
- 399 19. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, Xiao M, Chang D, Yang F, et al. Profiling early humoral
400 response to diagnose Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis*
401 2020;71:778-85.
- 402 20. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of
403 critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered,
404 retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir Med* 2020;8:475-81.
- 405 21. Liu ZL, Liu Y, Wan LG, Xiang TX, Le AP, Liu P, et al. Antibody profiles in mild
406 and severe cases of COVID-19. *Clin Chem* 2020;66:1102-1104.
- 407 22. Robbiani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, Lorenzi JCC, Wang Z, Cho A, et al.
408 Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature*
409 2020;584(7821):437-42.
- 410 23. Chen X, Pan Z, Yue S, Yu F, Zhang J, Yang Y, et al. Disease severity dictates
411 SARS-CoV-2-specific neutralizing antibody responses in COVID-19. *Signal Transduct*
412 *Target Ther* 2020(1):180.

- 413 24. Yongchen Z, Shen H, Wang X, Shi X, Li Y, Yan J, et al. Different longitudinal
414 patterns of nucleic acid and serology testing results based on disease severity of
415 COVID-19 patients. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020;9:833-36.
- 416 25. Bonelli F, Sarasini A, Zierold C, Calleri M, Bonetti A, Vismara C, et al. Clinical
417 and analytical performance of an automated serological test that identifies S1/S2
418 neutralizing IgG in COVID-19 patients semiquantitatively. *J Clin Microbiol*
419 2020;58(9):e01224-20.
- 420 26. Phipps WS, SoRelle JA, Li QZ, Mahimainathan L, Araj E, Markantonis J, et al.
421 SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Responses Do Not Predict COVID-19 Disease Severity. *Am J*
422 *Clin Pathol* 2020;154:459-65.
- 423 27. National S-C-SAEG. Performance characteristics of five immunoassays for
424 SARS-CoV-2: a head-to-head benchmark comparison. *Lancet Infect Dis*
425 2020;20:1390-400.
- 426 28. Van Elslande J, Decru B, Jonckheere S, Van Wijngaerden E, Houben E,
427 Vandecandelaere P, et al. Antibody response against SARS-CoV-2 spike protein and
428 nucleoprotein evaluated by four automated immunoassays and three ELISAs. *Clin*
429 *Microbiol Infect* 2020;26(11):1557.e1-1557.e7.2020.
- 430 29. Tang MS, Hock KG, Logsdon NM, Hayes JE, Gronowski AM, Anderson NW, et
431 al. Clinical performance of the Roche SARS-CoV-2 serologic assay. *Clin Chem*
432 2020;66:1107-1109.
- 433 30. Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, Zheng Y, Ding Y, Ni W, et al. Evaluation of Nucleocapsid
434 and Spike Protein-based ELISAs for detecting antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin*
435 *Microbiol* 2020;58(6):e00461-20.

- 436 31. Herroelen PH, Martens GA, De Smet D, Swaerts K, Decavele AS. Humoral
437 Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2. *Am J Clin Pathol* 2020 Aug 18. doi:
438 10.1093/ajcp/aqaa140.
- 439 32. Nicol T, Lefeuvre C, Serri O, Pivert A, Joubaud F, Dubee V, et al. Assessment
440 of SARS-CoV-2 serological tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 through the evaluation
441 of three immunoassays: Two automated immunoassays (Euroimmun and Abbott) and
442 one rapid lateral flow immunoassay (NG Biotech). *J Clin Virol* 2020;129:104511.
- 443 33. Charlton CL, Kanji JN, Johal K, Bailey A, Plitt SS, MacDonald C, et al.
444 Evaluation of six commercial mid to high volume antibody and six point of care lateral
445 flow assays for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. *J Clin Microbiol*
446 2020;58(10):e01361-20.
- 447 34. Tang MS, Hock KG, Logsdon NM, Hayes JE, Gronowski AM, Anderson NW, et
448 al. Clinical performance of two SARS-CoV-2 serologic assays. *Clin Chem*
449 2020;66:1055-1062.
- 450 35. Weidner L, Gansdorfer S, Unterweger S, Weseslindtner L, Drexler C, Farcet M,
451 et al. Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with eight commercially available
452 immunoassays. *J Clin Virol* 2020;129:104540.
- 453 36. Perkmann T, Perkmann-Nagele N, Breyer MK, Breyer-Kohansal R, Burghuber
454 OC, Hartl S, et al. Side by side comparison of three fully automated SARS-CoV-2
455 antibody assays with a focus on specificity. *Clin Chem* 2020;66:1405-1413.
- 456 37. Ekelund O, Ekblom K, Somajo S, Pattison-Granberg J, Olsson K, Petersson A.
457 High-throughput immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2, considerable differences in
458 performance when comparing three methods. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2020 [posted 2020
459 Sep 17]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20106294>.

- 460 38. Egger M, Bundschuh C, Wiesinger K, Gabriel C, Clodi M, Mueller T, et al.
461 Comparison of the Elecsys(R) Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay with the EDI enzyme
462 linked immunosorbent assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in human
463 plasma. *Clin Chim Acta* 2020;509:18-21.
- 464 39. Jaaskelainen AJ, Kekalainen E, Kallio-Kokko H, Mannonen L, Kortela E,
465 Vapalahti O, et al. Evaluation of commercial and automated SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA
466 ELISAs using coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patient samples. *Euro Surveill*
467 2020;25:2000603.
- 468 40. Montesinos I, Gruson D, Kabamba B, Dahma H, Van den Wijngaert S, Reza S,
469 et al. Evaluation of two automated and three rapid lateral flow immunoassays for the
470 detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. *J Clin Virol* 2020;128:104413.
- 471 41. Jaaskelainen AJ, Kuivanen S, Kekalainen E, Ahava MJ, Loginov R, Kallio-
472 Kokko H, et al. Performance of six SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays in comparison with
473 microneutralisation. *J Clin Virol* 2020;129:104512.
- 474 42. Gorse GJ, Patel GB, Vitale JN, O'Connor TZ. Prevalence of antibodies to four
475 human coronaviruses is lower in nasal secretions than in serum. *Clin Vaccine Immunol*
476 2010;17:1875-80.
- 477 43. Theel ES, Haring J, Hilgart H, Granger D. Performance characteristics of four
478 high-throughput immunoassays for detection of IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2.
479 *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58:e01243-20.
- 480 44. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Ruhl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. Brief clinical evaluation
481 of six high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. *J Clin Virol*
482 2020;129:104480.

- 483 45. Van Elslande J, Houben E, Depypere M, Brackenier A, Desmet S, Andre E, et
484 al. Diagnostic performance of seven rapid IgG/IgM antibody tests and the Euroimmun
485 IgA/IgG ELISA in COVID-19 patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020;26:1082-87.
- 486 46. Kruttgen A, Cornelissen CG, Dreher M, Hornef M, Imohl M, Kleines M.
487 Comparison of four new commercial serologic assays for determination of SARS-CoV-
488 2 IgG. *J Clin Virol* 2020;128:104394.
- 489 47. Harb R, Remaley AT, Sacks DB. Evaluation of Three Commercial Automated
490 Assays for the Detection of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies. *Clin Chem* 2020;66:1351-3.
- 491 48. Favresse J, Eucher C, Elsen M, Tre-Hardy M, Dogne JM, Douxfils J. Clinical
492 Performance of the Elecsys Electrochemiluminescent Immunoassay for the Detection
493 of SARS-CoV-2 Total Antibodies. *Clin Chem* 2020;66:1104-6.

494 **Supporting information**

495

496 **S1 Fig. p-values for differences in qualitative test results for the four**
497 **immunoassays in the PCR-positive clinical cohort.** The dotted line represents a p-
498 value of 0.05.

499 **S1 Table. Sensitivities (with 95% confidence interval) of the different**
500 **immunoassays grouped into time bins.**

501 **S2 Fig. p-values for differences between patients by death and sepsis for the**
502 **four immunoassays at different time points.** The dotted line represents a p-value of
503 0.05. (A) Differences in qualitative values for deceased and surviving patients.
504 (B) Differences between mean signal ratios for deceased and surviving patients.
505 (C) Differences in qualitative values for septic and non-septic patients.
506 (D) Differences between mean signal ratios for septic and non-septic patients.

507 **S3 Fig. Pairwise comparison of signal ratios between the different**
508 **immunoassays in the PCR-positive clinical cohort.** Spearman correlation
509 coefficient (R) and p-values are shown. The dotted lines represent the cutoff values for
510 a positive test result.

511 **S4 Fig. Distributions of signal ratios for the four different immunoassays in the**
512 **PCR-positive clinical cohort.** The dotted lines represent the cutoff values for a
513 positive test result. (A) EUR S-IgA. (B) EUR S-IgG. (C) EUR N-IgG. (D) Roche-Ab.

514 **S5 Fig. Individual results in the PCR-positive clinical cohort for the four different**
515 **immunoassays in the non-ARDS group.**

516 **S6 Fig. Individual results in the PCR-positive clinical cohort for the four different**
517 **immunoassays in the ARDS group (first set).**

518 **S7 Fig. Individual results in the PCR-positive clinical cohort for the four different**
519 **immunoassays in the ARDS group (second set).**

520 **S8 Fig. Individual qualitative results in the PCR-positive clinical cohort for the**
521 **four different immunoassays in the non-ARDS group.**

522 **S9 Fig. Individual qualitative results in the PCR-positive clinical cohort for the**
523 **four different immunoassays in the ARDS group (first set).**

524 **S10 Fig. Individual qualitative results in the PCR-positive clinical cohort for the**
525 **four different immunoassays in the ARDS group (second set).**

526 **S11 Fig. Overlap of positive results between immunoassays in the two negative**
527 **cohorts. (A) Pre-COVID-19 cohort. (B) PCR-negative clinical cohort.**
528 (This plot was generated using the UpSetR R package)

529 **S2 Table. Median age for true negative and false positive subjects in the negative**
530 **cohorts**

531 **S12 Fig. Distributions of signal ratios for the four different immunoassays in the**
532 **pre-COVID-19 cohort.** The dotted lines represent the cutoff values for a positive test
533 result. (A) EUR S-IgA. (B) EUR S-IgG. (C) EUR N-IgG. (D) Roche-Ab.

534 **S13 Fig. Distributions of signal ratios for the four different immunoassays in the**
535 **PCR-negative clinical cohort.** The dotted lines represent the cutoff values for a
536 positive test result. (A) EUR S-IgA. (B) EUR S-IgG. (C) EUR N-IgG. (D) Roche-Ab.

537 **Table 1. Characterization of the PCR-positive clinical cohort and stratification into non-ARDS and ARDS patients with**
 538 **respective median seroconversion times.**

	non-ARDS (n=9)	ARDS (n=20)	total (n=29)	p-value
females (n)	1	5	6	0.6328
males (n)	8	15	23	
age (median [min, max])	79 [32, 88]	70 [40, 81]	71 [32, 88]	0.2672
immunosuppression (n)	2	11	13	0.1296
sample count (median [min, max])	10 [7, 28]	15.5 [8, 30]	15 [7, 30]	N/A
sampling period (median [min, max])	29 [26, 64]	31 [20, 62]	29 [20, 64]	N/A
median seroconversion time EUR S-IgA (days [lq; uq])	14 [13; 15]	8 [7; 10]	10 [7; 13.25]	0.0022
median seroconversion time EUR S-IgG (days [lq; uq])	17 [14; 17]	8.5 [7.25; 10]	10 [8; 16]	0.0130
median seroconversion time EUR N-IgG (days [lq; uq])	11 [7.75; 13.25]	8 [7; 10]	9 [7; 10.5]	0.3365
median seroconversion time Roche-Ab (days [lq; uq])	14.5 [9.75; 15.25]	8 [7.5; 10]	9 [8, 12.5]	0.0243

539

540 lq: lower quartile, uq: upper quartile

541 **Table 2. Antibody reactivity and specificity of the four immunoassays in two negative cohorts.**

assay	test result	pre-COVID19 cohort			PCR-negative clinical cohort			combined (n=495)
		female (n=146)	male (n=92)	total (n=238)	female (n=115)	male (n=142)	total (n=257)	
EUR S-IgA	neg.	139 (95.2%)	79 (85.9%)	218 (91.6%)	114 (99.1%)	133 (93.7%)	247 (96.1%)	465 (93.9%)
	pos.	7 (4.8%)	13 (14.1%)	20 (8.4%)	1 (0.9%)	9 (6.3%)	10 (3.9%)	30 (6.1%)
	Specificity (%) [95% CI]	95.2 90.4-98.1	85.9 77.0-92.3	91.6 87.3-94.8	99.1 95.3-100.0	93.7 88.3-97.1	96.1 93.0-98.1	93.9 91.5-95.9
EUR S-IgG	neg.	146 (100%)	90 (97.8%)	236 (99.2%)	115 (100.0%)	141 (99.3%)	256 (99.6%)	492 (99.4%)
	pos.	0 (0%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (0.6%)
	Specificity (%) [95% CI]	100.0 97.5-100.0	97.8 92.4-99.7	99.2 97.0-99.9	100.0 96.8-100.0	99.3 96.1-100.0	99.6 97.9-100.0	99.4 98.2-99.9
EUR N-IgG	neg.	146 (100%)	90 (97.8%)	236 (99.2%)	112 (97.4%)	141 (99.3%)	253 (98.4%)	489 (98.8%)
	pos.	0 (0%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (0.8%)	3 (2.6%)	1 (0.7%)	4 (1.6%)	6 (1.2%)
	Specificity (%) [95% CI]	100.0 97.5-100.0	97.8 92.4-99.7	99.2 97.0-99.9	97.4 92.6-99.5	99.3 96.1-100.0	98.4 96.1-99.6	98.8 97.4-99.6
Roche-Ab	neg.	146 (100%)	92 (100%)	238 (100%)	115 (100.0%)	142 (100.0%)	257 (100.0%)	495 (100.0%)
	pos.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	Specificity (%) [95% CI]	100.0 97.5-100.0	100.0 96.1-100.0	100.0 98.5-100.0	100 96.8-100.0	100 97.4-100.0	100 98.6-100.0	100 99.3-100.0

542

543 neg.: negative, pos.: positive, CI: confidence interval

544 **Table 3. p-values of pairwise comparisons between specificities of immunoassays in the two sets of negative samples and**
 545 **both sets analyzed together (combined).**

	pre-Covid-19 cohort	PCR-negative clinical cohort	combined
S-IgA : S-IgG	1.4×10^{-4}	1.6×10^{-2}	3.0×10^{-6}
S-IgA : N-IgG	1.4×10^{-4}	1.8×10^{-1}	8.0×10^{-5}
S-IgA : Roche-Ab	2.1×10^{-5}	4.4×10^{-3}	1.2×10^{-7}
N-IgG : S-IgG	1.0	3.7×10^{-1}	4.5×10^{-1}
S-IgG : Roche-Ab	4.8×10^{-1}	1.0	2.5×10^{-1}
N-IgG : Roche-Ab	4.8×10^{-1}	1.3×10^{-1}	4.1×10^{-2}

546

547 The immunoassay with lower specificity is mentioned first




Fig 1. Time course of COVID-19 patient sampling.

Day 0 represents symptom onset, crosses indicate the time of the first positive PCR result, dots indicate individual samples. (A) Non-ARDS patients. (B) ARDS patients.




Fig 2. Immunoassay results over the course of time after symptom onset. (A) Sensitivity in all patients. (B) Sensitivity in non-ARDS patients. (C) Sensitivity in ARDS patients. (D) Mean signal ratios of the four immunoassays in non-ARDS patients and ARDS patients.




Fig 3. p-values of the differences between non-ARDS patients and ARDS patients for the four immunoassays at different time points. The dotted line represents a p-value of 0.05. (A) Differences in qualitative values. (B) Differences between mean signal ratios.